City of Lafayette
Public Meeting Agenda – AMENDED
Lafayette City Council
Redevelopment Agency

Tuesday, May 26, - **7:00PM**
Lafayette Community Center – **Manzanita Room**
500 St. Mary's Road, Lafayette CA

The following item has been added to the City Council meeting agenda:

10. CONSENT CALENDAR

H. **Response to TRANSPAC's Comment Letter Regarding its Central County Action Plan**
Recommendation: Authorize Mayor to send response letter to TRANSPAC

I, Tracy Robinson, declare under penalty of perjury that this agenda has been .posted at least 72 hours in advance at the Lafayette City Offices, 3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Suite 210, Lafayette, CA.

City of Lafayette Staff Report

For:	City Council
By:	Leah C. Greenblat, Transportation Planner
Date Written:	May 22, 2009
Meeting Date:	May 26, 2009
Subject:	Response to TRANSPAC's Comment Letter Regarding its Central County Action Plan

---

Introduction / Discussion

In November of 2008, the City Council agreed to send a comment letter, attached, to TRANSPAC, a regional transportation planning committee of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) on the Draft Central County Action Plan expressing the City's concerns regarding downstream traffic impacts on Pleasant Hill Road and Reliez Valley Road. TRANSPAC sent a response letter, attached, which City staff did not receive until May 1, 2009. In reviewing the response letter, staff consulted with Mayor Tatzin, Lafayette's representative to the CCTA, regarding the content of TRANSPAC's response to the concerns raised by Lafayette.

Both staff and Mayor Tatzin support TRANSPAC's proposal to work jointly on developing a corridor management plan for Pleasant Hill Road. However, the City's other comments contained in its letter were not sufficiently responded to in the TRANSPAC response letter. We have been advised by Martin Engelmann of the CCTA that if Lafayette has found the response to comments unsatisfactory, the City needs to submit a letter stating such. Staff prepared a draft response letter, attached, for the Council's consideration.

Fiscal Impact

None.

Recommendation

1. Authorize the Mayor to send response letter to TRANSPAC

Attachments

1. Draft response letter
2. February 23, 2009 letter from TRANSPAC Chair
3. November 14, 2008 letter from Mayor Mike Anderson

c:\users\lgreenblat\documents\leah's work files\city council\staff reports\2009\transpac action plan response2response ltr.doc

May XX, 2009

Mr. Mark Ross
Chair
TRANSPAC
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Ste. 360
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Dear Chair Ross:

Thank you for your response letter regarding the City of Lafayette's comments on the draft TRANSPAC Action Plan. We appreciate and support your proposal to develop a Corridor Management Plan for Pleasant Hill Road We look forward to working with you in acquiring funding and further developing a scope of work for this important undertaking.

The City of Lafayette's Council, Circulation Commission and staff spent considerable time reviewing the draft TRANSPAC Action Plan and preparing a thoughtful list of comments. In the spirit of cooperation, we would like TRANSPAC to respond to the Action Plan comments contained in our original letter dated November 14, 2008 so that we understand what changes may or may not have been incorporated and why.

Thank you again and we look forward to working with TRANSPAC on Pleasant Hill Road corridor issues. Should you have any questions, please contact me or Leah Greenblat, Transportation Planner at 925.299.3229.

Sincerely,

Don Tatzin
Mayor

cc: SWAT
SWAT TAC
Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager
Martin Engelmann, CCTA
Circulation Commission
Leah Greenblat

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Ste. 360, Pleasant Hill, California 94523 (925) 969-0841

February 23, 2009

The Honorable Mike Anderson
Mayor
City of Lafayette
3675 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Suite 210
Lafayette, California 94549

Dear Mayor Anderson:

Thank you for the City of Lafayette's comment letter on the Draft TRANSPAC Action Plan. TRANSPAC has reviewed comments in depth and appreciates your interest in working together to address the transportation issues which affect our respective communities

In specific regard to Pleasant Hill Road, we were a little surprised by some of the comments in the City of Lafayette's letter. TRANSPAC jurisdictions have long been aware of and sensitive to the role of Pleasant Hill Road as an important local street serving residential neighborhoods and public schools in both Lafayette and TRANSPAC jurisdictions. We have long considered the desire of the Lafayette community (as well as that of TRANSPAC jurisdictions) to preserve the character and quality of the residential neighborhoods in close proximity to Pleasant Hill Road (and, indeed, the Pleasant Hill Road/Taylor Boulevard corridor), as well as the need to protect the neighborhoods and public schools in that same proximity. TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions have pursued and/or supported many of the objectives and actions set forth in SWAT's 1998 Pleasant Hill Road Action Plan and 2008 Lamorinda Action Plan Update, including, among other things:

1. Supporting projects and programs that add person trip capacity on regional freeway routes that could divert traffic from Pleasant Hill Road;

2. Participating in the signal coordination study on Pleasant Hill Road and Taylor Boulevard and implement recommendations subject to City review and approval;

3. Supporting development of HOV lane programs on all applicable freeway and regional routes where feasible;

4. Supporting the provision of public transit service and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs (indeed, we have a highly successful TDM program and have steadfastly sought to increase ridesharing and transit ridership by promoting carpools to BART stations and to other destinations such as Diablo Valley College and Sun Valley Mall, including pressing for the DVC Transit Center Project);

5. Supporting the development of regional bicycle facilities; and

6. Participation in the Central, East, Southwest Arterial and Freeway Ramp Metering Study. TRANSPAC believes that the best course of action is for TRANSPAC (and its member jurisdictions) and SWAT (and its member jurisdictions) to join forces in the cooperative spirit envisioned by the Action Plan process to define the Pleasant Hill Road corridor and secure funding for development of a Corridor Management Plan. In fact, we believe that the foregoing listed actions provide a strong foundation for such cooperation. We believe that as part of that process we can identify issues, and develop actions (and possibly projects) to address those issues. We look forward to the opportunity to work more closely with SWAT – and the City of Lafayette in particular – on these important issues.

Again, thank you for your comments on the Central County Action Plan. TRANSPAC hopes that this response is useful to you. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager at (510) 268-8980.

Sincerely,

Mark Ross
Chair

cc: TRANSPAC Representatives
TRANSPAC TAC
Martin Engelmann, CCTA

LAFAYETTE
SETTLED 1848 — INCORPORATED 1968

CITY COUNCIL

Mike Anderson, Mayor
Don Tatzin, Vice Mayor
Brandt Andersson, Council Member
Carl Anduri, Council Member
Carol Federighi, Council Member

November 14, 2008

Barbara Neustadter,
TRANSPAC Manager
2300 contra Costa Boulevard, Ste. 360
Pleasant Hill, CA 94512

Dear Ms. Neustadter:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the October 9, 2008 Draft Central County Action Plan. The City of Lafayette's Circulation Commission discussed and reviewed the document and the City Council authorized sending this letter at its November 10, 2008 meeting.

We were pleased to see the inclusion of Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) in the draft plan; however we would prefer more ambitious MTSOs in terms of addressing downstream traffic impacts on Pleasant Hill Road and Reliez Valley Road. The draft plan tends to focus more of its attention towards vehicles entering the TRANSPAC region, but not vehicles leaving TRANSPAC and entering the SWAT region.

A recent Contra Costa Times article suggests that the City of Concord is considering requiring one parking space per each dwelling unit bedroom due to their belief that the residents will continue to drive as often as they have been doing. The article explains that Concord city leaders also are contemplating this type of parking requirement in areas near BART. This Concord situation is an example of why we are concerned about downstream traffic impacts in Lafayette. We applaud TRANSPAC's effort to keep vehicles on Highway 4 and I-680 east of I-680. We would welcome that same commitment to move vehicles to I-680 rather than have them travel along roads parallel to and west of the I-680.

The table below contains the City of Lafayette's additional official comments on the draft Plan.

3675 MT. DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 210, LAFAYETTE, CA 94549
TELEPHONE: (925) 284-1968 FAX: (925) 284-3169
http//:www.ci.lafayette.ca.us

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
1.	N/A	Concord Naval Weapons Station	While the development of this site is still in the planning stage, it is insufficient to relegate discussion of this large, known future development to several footnotes within the Plan. A discussion should be added explaining the future review process. For example, what will the City of Concord need to do to process the project in terms of the GMP for Measure J compliance?
2.	N/A	Evaluation of MTSOs contained in current Action Plan	The draft Plan lacks but should include an evaluation of past MTSOs contained in the current Action Plan.
3.	Page 2	Figure 1-1	Enlarge Figure 1-1 to a legible size. The map and legend should be usable if copied in black and white and not just color.
4.	Page 5	Land Use and Transportation Trends	The draft Plan contains no presentation of the analysis of the past MTSOs (or TSOs) contained in 2000 Update of the Central County Action Plan. The Plan also contains no forecasts of the MTSOs values contained in the draft Plan. Without this information, trends and changes on specific routes cannot be sufficiently monitored. For example, on page 20 of the draft Lamorinda Action Plan, Table 6 summarizes past, present and future MTSOs.
5.	Page 7	Table 2-2	Thank you for including the actual predicted growth figures. The percentages provided have the potential to mislead the reader into comparing the percent change from region to region which wouldn't be accurate. For example, Central County experienced an increase of 9000 jobs or a 5% increase in the total number of Central County jobs. Lamorinda also experienced a 5% increase, but it only had 1000 new jobs. Since the "% Change" is provided in the table, add a note of explanation to avoid this likely

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
			confusion.
6.	Page 8	Expected growth in senior population	The growth in senior population is identified as a growing trend, but no direct analysis is included on the possible transportation impacts of this trend. Chapter 4 does not identify this as an issue, objective or an item needing an action. Develop actions to incorporate and address this trend.
7.	Page 9	Figures 2-1 & 2-2	These Figures cite their sources at the "CCTA Countywide Travel Demand Model, 2008." Does this model include ABAG's recent shift in housing allocations?
8.	Page 10	Appendix C	Appendix C was not included in the document on TRANSPAC's website. Appendix C should be made available and the main body of the draft Plan should include summaries describing the content and trends contained in Appendix C.
9.	Page 10	Figure 2-3	Why were only "Key Roadways" included in this figure? What criteria were used to select Key Roadways? The information presented in this figure is of importance for all Routes of Regional Significance and it should be presented in the draft Plan. Enlarge figure so street names are legible. Add Pleasant Hill Road as a Key Roadway and identify the peak direction of travel for each Key Roadway.
10.	Page 11	Data Source	Cite the source of the information presented in the first sentence: Traffic demand in "…Central Contra Costa is projected to increase by about 30 percent."
11.	Pages 13, 16 & 17	East-Central Traffic Management Plan and the Central Contra Costa	These documents should be made available on the TRANSPAC website. How do these two documents differ? Are Alhambra Avenue, Geary Road, Pleasant Hill Road, and Taylor

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
		Traffic Management Program	Blvd. included in these plans?
12.	Page 22	Goal 5	Jurisdictions need to determine the future capacity of the BART system before counting on BART as a means of commuting. What analysis has occurred to determine that adequate transit capacity exists?
13.	Page 26	Paragraph 1	If "TRANSPAC will continue to work closely with neighboring RTPCs…on shared Regional Routes" then further coordination is required to bring consistency with the Lamorinda Action Plan's MTSOs for PHR and the Central County Action Plan's MTSOs on routes linking to PHR in Lafayette.
14.	Page 33	MTSOs	We are not aware of other MTSOs that change by jurisdiction boundary. This may be okay and help a jurisdiction maintain its unique character. But a consistent methodology for corridor-wide analysis is still needed. What type of coordination will be necessary to comprehensively evaluate each Route of Regional Significance? Given the exceptionally low thresholds of these MTSOs, how will decision makers gauge the impacts of their land use decisions on regional routes?
15.	Page 35	Alhambra Ave.	What actions were considered and why were they not included to discourage the use of Alhambra Ave. as a shortcut to SR 24 via PHR and Reliez Valley Road? If not already included, expand the existing Traffic Management Program to Geary, Taylor and Alhambra to encourage delay in order to discourage use of westbound/southbound traffic using PHR and Reliez Valley Road to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Drivers from SR-4 also use these routes

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
			to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in Pleasant Hill?
16.	Page 38	Geary Road	If not already included, expand the existing Traffic Management Program to Geary, Taylor and Alhambra to encourage delay in order to discourage use of westbound/southbound traffic using PHR and Reliez Valley Road to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in Pleasant Hill?
17.	Page 41	Pleasant Hill Road	Because two schools directly abut PHR in Lafayette, pedestrian and bicycle access and safety are primary concerns that would need to be addressed in any traffic management plan. The sentence in the Actions and Responsibilities bullet is incomplete. State what other elements were considered. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in Walnut Creek and the County?
18.	Page 42	Taylor Blvd.	If not already included, expand the existing Traffic Management Program to Geary, Taylor and Alhambra to encourage delay in order to discourage use of westbound/southbound traffic using PHR and Reliez Valley Road to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in the County?
19.	Page 48	TRANSPAC Traffic Mitigation	Paragraphs 1 and 2 state that the developer mitigates the impacts of "both the sponsoring jurisdiction and other affected jurisdictions." Lafayette is a

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
		Program	jurisdiction that abuts and is downstream of TRANSPAC. Staff is not aware of any existing agreement between Lafayette and TRANSPAC to address traffic impacts from outside of the Lafayette. Clarify if such an agreement exists and provide an example of an impact to a downstream, non-TRANSPAC jurisdiction that TRANSPAC's fee program has mitigated.
20.	Page 51 & 54	Table 5-1: Pleasant Hill Rd. Improvement Project, Phases iii, iv, v	Please provide a project description of this project and revise the project name to clearly incorporate the scope of the project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Central County Action Plan. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Leah Greenblat, Transportation Planner, at 925.299.3229.

Thank you again for seeking our input.

Sincerely,

Mike Anderson
Mayor

Enclosure
cc: SWAT
Circulation Commission
Martin Engelmann